

Effect of Screening on Thermonuclear Fusion in Stellar and Laboratory Plasmas

L. Wilets^a, B. G. Giraud^b, M. J. Watrous^a and J. J. Rehr^a

^aDepartment of Physics, BOX 351560, Univ. of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-1560, USA

^bService de Physique Théorique, CE Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France

Received _____; accepted _____

ABSTRACT

The fusion enhancement factor due to screening in the solar plasma is calculated. We use the finite temperature Green's function method and a self consistent mean field approximation. We reduce this to one center problems, because in the collision of two fusing ions, the turning point where tunneling may occur lies far inside the screening radius. The numerical results given by this method indicate that screening may be slightly weaker than that obtained in the most recent previous calculations.

1. Introduction

There remains continued interest in the solar neutrino problem which has not been resolved in terms of the standard solar model and standard particle physics. Neutrinos are generated in thermonuclear reactions, and thermonuclear reaction rates are determined by solar physics (temperature and density), nuclear physics, and atomic shielding. The solar neutrino problem is just one of several examples where there is current interest in thermonuclear reaction rates; others include general stellar structure and laboratory plasmas. We address here the role of atomic shielding, using a finite temperature Green’s function method. Recent calculations of screening effects in the sun have been reported by Gruzinov and Bahcall 1998, who also review previous solar screening calculations. Results of those calculations, with which we compare our present work, exhibit a scatter of 10 to 30% or more in the effect of screening on fusion rates. As discussed in Gruzinov and Bahcall 1998, all of these previous calculations are based either on Salpeter’s weak screening formula, which is a classical approximation, or else make unphysical approximations in order to go beyond the linear regime. Gruzinov and Bahcall attempted to rectify these limitations by including quantum effects, treating the kinetic energy in perturbation theory. Our model differs from theirs in that we do not rely on perturbation theory.

The physical model we employ is based on self-consistent Hartree plus finite temperature, local density approximation for exchange and correlation and assumes thermal equilibrium and adiabaticity in the internuclear coordinates. We solve this model making no further approximations or expansions, except for numerics which are carefully monitored. All previous calculations are essentially approximations to this model, involving *e.g.* expansions in the temperature, density or quantum corrections. Carraro et al. 1988 also consider dynamic effects. Thus we believe that our approach yields results which are the most accurate to date. These results yield fusion enhancement factors which are typically a

little smaller than those recently reported (Gruzinov and Bahcall 1998).

The rate of thermonuclear fusion in plasmas is governed by barrier penetration. The barrier itself is dominated by the Coulomb repulsion of the fusing nuclei. Because the barrier potential appears in the exponent of the Gamow formula, the result is very sensitive to the effects of screening by electrons and positive ions in the plasma. Screening lowers the barrier and thus enhances the fusion rate; it is more important the greater the nuclear charges, and thus plays an important role in the solar neutrino spectrum.

As shown below, the classical turning point radius which enters in the WKB integral for barrier penetration is very small compared with the characteristic screening lengths of interest. Inside this radius, the barrier potential is just the nucleus-nucleus Coulomb repulsion minus a constant due to screening. The constant can be interpreted simply as the difference in free energies of the system for either united and separated nuclei. Since both of these are spherically symmetric, one needs only consider one-center problems.

We present here numerical calculations relevant to the solar core. The screening due to electrons in the plasma is calculated quantum mechanically by a novel Green’s function method described in a recent paper (Watrous et al. 1999). The screening due to the ions is treated classically but self-consistently with the electrons. The resultant enhancement factors for several nuclear reactions are presented and compared with earlier results by other authors.

2. Fusion rate

We work in atomic units, $e = \hbar = m_e = k_B = 1$; the unit of atomic temperature is $3.159 \times 10^5 K$. As shown by Salpeter 1954 (here we follow Clayton 1968), the fusion

reaction rate between species 1 and 2 is given by

$$r_{1,2} = N_1 N_2 \int_0^\infty \psi(E) v(E) \sigma(E) dE, \quad (1)$$

where N_1 and N_2 are the number densities of the colliding nuclides, $\psi(E)$ is the Maxwellian probability that the center-of mass-energy at large separation is E ; and the cross section σ is written as a product of a penetrability factor P and a nuclear factor σ_{nuc} ,

$$\sigma(E) = P(E) \sigma_{nuc}(E). \quad (2)$$

In the WKB approximation, the s-wave penetration is given by

$$P_0(E) = \left(\frac{E_B}{E} \right)^{1/2} \exp \left[-2\sqrt{2\mu} \int_R^{R_0} [Z_1 Z_2 / r + U_{sc}(r) - E]^{1/2} dr \right], \quad (3)$$

with E_B the height of the barrier, μ the reduced mass and $U_{sc}(r) < 0$ the screening potential; R is the “touching” radius (the top of the barrier), and R_0 is the classical turning radius. The integrand in Eq. (1) peaks at some characteristic energy E_0 . For the solar interior, the corresponding classical turning radius

$$R_0 \approx Z_1 Z_2 / E_0,$$

is ~ 0.005 au compared with a screening radius of ~ 0.5 au. For this reason, the screening potential can be taken as a constant $U_0 \equiv U_{sc}(r=0) < 0$ within the turning radius, acting as an effective shift in the energy:

$$r_{1,2} = N_1 N_2 \int_0^\infty \psi(E) v(E) P(E - U_0) \sigma_{nuc}(E - U_0) dE \quad (4)$$

$$\propto \int_0^\infty E^{1/2} e^{-E/T} P(E - U_0) \sigma_{nuc}(E - U_0) dE \quad (5)$$

$$= \int_{-U_0}^\infty (E' + U_0)^{1/2} e^{-(E' + U_0)/T} P(E') \sigma_{nuc}(E') dE'. \quad (6)$$

Then, neglecting U_0 in the limit of integration,

$$r_{1,2} \approx e^{-U_0/T} N_1 N_2 \int_0^\infty \psi(E) v(E) \sigma(E) dE. \quad (7)$$

Screening thus enhances the reaction rate by the factor

$$f = e^{-U_0/T}, \quad (8)$$

where U_0 is given by Eq. (10) below. Since $U_0 < 0$, $f > 1$, corresponding to enhancement.

3. Free Energy and the One Center Problem

The screening potential is just the change, brought about by the approaching ions, in the Helmholtz free energy

$$F = U_{internal} - T S, \quad (9)$$

as a function of nuclear separation. Because of the smallness of the turning radius, it is sufficient to consider the one-center problems and identify

$$U_0 = F(Z_1 + Z_2) - F(Z_1) - F(Z_2). \quad (10)$$

What we mean here by one-center problems are the calculations of F when either charges Z_1, Z_2 , or both lie at the center of the plasma. In Sec. IV we calculate $F(Z)$ explicitly for an independent particle model approximation, akin to the temperature dependent Hartree-Fock method. However, the free energy has a simple and completely general (for the problem at hand) interpretation, which does not depend on the mean field approximation. It is, by definition, the work required at a given temperature to introduce the nuclear charge into the plasma. The nucleus only interacts with the plasma electrostatically, so $dF = \phi(Z', r=0)dZ'$, and thus the work required to assemble the charge Z at, say, $r=0$ is

$$F(Z) = \int_0^Z \phi(Z', r=0) dZ', \quad (11)$$

where $\phi(Z', r)$ is the electrostatic potential generated in the plasma due to a nuclear charge Z' ,

$$\phi(Z', r=0) = 4\pi \int_0^\infty r' dr' \left[\sum_I \rho_I(r', T) - \rho_e(r', T) \right]. \quad (12)$$

Here $\rho_e(r, T)$ and $\rho_I(r, T)$ denote the finite temperature number density (recall $e = 1$) of the electrons and various background ions charge densities, respectively.

The one-center screening problem is solved by the methods described by Watrous et al. 1999 for the electrons with a Kohn-Sham formalism, using the finite temperature local density approximation (Mermin 1965) for exchange and correlation. Screening due to ions is included as well as that due to electrons. The ions are treated classically according to the Debye-Huckel method. Thus the electric potential generated by electrons and ions becomes

$$\Phi(r) = \frac{Z}{r} + \int d^3r' \frac{\sum_I \rho_I(r', T) - \rho_e(r', T)}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|}. \quad (13)$$

The second term is the function denoted by $\phi(Z, r)$ above. Each ion density is given by

$$\rho_I(r, T) = \rho_I(\infty) e^{-Z_I \Phi(r)/T}. \quad (14)$$

Since $\Phi(r)$ is positive, ions are pushed outward and electrons are drawn toward the nucleus. For notational simplicity in the following, the temperature dependence of the densities will be understood and not specified explicitly.

4. Alternative Mean Field Derivation of the Free Energy

We now demonstrate the equivalence of the F defined by equations (9) and (11) in the finite-temperature Hartree(-Fock) approximation, which is similar to the finite temperature local density approximation actually used in our numerical calculations. In a transparent, short notation, we describe the system by a second-quantized Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ containing the kinetic energy operators t_i of the particles present in the plasma, their two-body interactions v_{ij} , and the additional one-body operators $w_i = -Z/r_i$ or $+Z_I Z/r_i$ representing the contributions of the additional nuclear charge Z at the center. The temperature T enters

the formalism via the the usual Boltzman factor $\exp(-\beta\mathcal{H})$ where $\beta = 1/T$. Actually, because the average electronic density and background positive charge density are fixed parameters of the problem, $\mathcal{H}$ must be replaced by the usual constrained Hamiltonian. This will read, in a short notation, $\mathcal{H} - \mu'\mathcal{N}$. Here μ' is a several-component chemical potential because of the several components in the plasma (i.e., electrons and various background ions). Accordingly the particle number operator $\mathcal{N}$ must be understood as a several-component operator. For simplicity, however, the following equations deal with the electrons only. This is because the positive ions in the background may consist of bosons as well as fermions, and we want to spare the reader the cumbersome symmetrization or antisymmetrization formulae for such backgrounds. In any case, the present paper describes the background density classically, and this density is not high enough to demand exchange terms.

The independent particle ansatz approximates the eigenstates of $\mathcal{H} - \mu'\mathcal{N}$ by antisymmetrized products of single particle states (orbitals) $|i\rangle$, with an approximate spectrum made of sums of independent particle levels η_i . The infinite set of orbitals $|i\rangle$ and eigenvalues η_i define a one-body operator $\mathcal{H}_0 - \mu'\mathcal{N}$, presumed optimal from the point of view of a variational principle: i.e., stationarity of the grand potential or free energy F .

In second quantization, the many-body density matrix used as a *trial* density operator (noted in the following by quantities carrying a subscript t) is

$$D_t = \frac{\exp[-\beta(\mathcal{H}_0 - \mu'\mathcal{N})]}{Z_t} = \frac{\exp(-\beta \sum_i \eta_i c_i^\dagger c_i)}{Z_t}, \quad (15)$$

where $c_i^\dagger$ and c_i are the usual fermionic creation and annihilation operators for orbital $|i\rangle$. For electrons the normalization denominator Z_t is

$$Z_t = \prod_i [1 + \exp(-\beta\eta_i)], \quad (16)$$

so the trial density becomes

$$D_t = \prod_i \frac{\exp(-\beta \eta_i c_i^\dagger c_i)}{1 + \exp(-\beta \eta_i)}. \quad (17)$$

The *true* density matrix $D = \exp[-\beta(\mathcal{H} - \mu' \mathcal{N})] / \text{Tr} \exp[-\beta(\mathcal{H} - \mu' \mathcal{N})]$, minimizes the *true* grand potential, $\Omega = \text{Tr} D(\mathcal{H} - \mu' \mathcal{N} + \beta^{-1} \ln D)$. However, with an independent particle approximation one must be content with minimizing

$$F = \text{Tr} D_t(\mathcal{H} - \mu' \mathcal{N} + \beta^{-1} \ln D_t). \quad (18)$$

It is easy to show that

$$\text{Tr} D_t c_i^\dagger c_i c_j^\dagger c_j = f_i f_j, \quad \text{if } i \neq j, \quad (19)$$

where the Fermi occupation numbers are $f_i \equiv \text{Tr} D_t c_i^\dagger c_i = 1/[1 + \exp(\beta \eta_i)]$. Furthermore

$$\text{Tr} D_t \{-\beta \eta_i c_i^\dagger c_i - \ln[1 + \exp(-\beta \eta_i)]\} = f_i \ln f_i + (1 - f_i) \ln(1 - f_i). \quad (20)$$

Finally, because $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{T} + \mathcal{W}) + \mathcal{V}$ is the sum of a one-body operator $\mathcal{T} + \mathcal{W} \equiv \sum_i t_i + \sum_i w_i$ and a two-body operator $\mathcal{V} \equiv \sum_{i>j} v_{ij}$, we obtain

$$F = \sum_i f_i \langle i | (t + w - \mu') | i \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} f_i f_j \langle ij | \tilde{v} | ij \rangle + \beta^{-1} \sum_i [f_i \ln f_i + (1 - f_i) \ln(1 - f_i)]. \quad (21)$$

Here the tilde $\tilde{v}$ means that the matrix element $\langle ij | \tilde{v} | ij \rangle$ is antisymmetrized.

The functional derivative of F with respect to $\langle i |$ is then

$$\frac{\delta F}{\delta \langle i |} = f_i \left(t + w - \mu' + \sum_j f_j \langle \cdot j | \tilde{v} | ij \rangle \right), \quad (22)$$

where one recognizes the action of a mean field potential, including both direct and exchange terms

$$\mathcal{U} | i \rangle \equiv \sum_j f_j \langle \cdot j | \tilde{v} | ij \rangle. \quad (23)$$

Stationarity of F with respect to $| i \rangle$ then gives the “finite temperature Hartree-Fock” equations,

$$(t + w - \mu' + \mathcal{U}) | i \rangle = \eta_i | i \rangle, \quad \forall i, \quad (24)$$

where one recognizes that η_i is the Lagrange multiplier for the normalization of the orbital.

In the same way, the derivative of F with respect to η_i , or as well f_i , yields

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial f_i} = \eta_i + \beta^{-1} \ln [f_i/1 - f_i], \quad (25)$$

which vanishes [see Eq. (20)]. It can thus be concluded that

$$F = -\beta^{-1} \ln Z_t - \text{Tr} D_t \mathcal{V}, \quad (26)$$

(which *differs* from $-\beta^{-1} \ln Z_t$) is stationary with respect to variations of D_t . Therefore, since $\mathcal{W}$ is proportional to the additional charge Z at the center, the derivative of F with respect to Z must be given by

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial Z} = \text{Tr} D_t \frac{\mathcal{W}}{Z}. \quad (27)$$

Notice also that $\mathcal{W}$ is a local potential. Hence, in the coordinate representation, only the diagonal part of D_t (the classical density) is needed to calculate $\partial F/\partial Z$,

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial Z} = 4\pi \int r' dr' [\rho_p(r') - \rho_e(r')], \quad (28)$$

which is the differential form of Eqs. (11-12). Here $\rho_e(r')$ and $\rho_p(r')$ are diagonal matrix elements $\langle r'|D_t|r' \rangle$ in the electron and positive background sectors, respectively. It will be noticed that Eq. (28) gives the background density as well as the electronic density, while the preceding equations, Eqs. (15-27), accounted for the electrons only. In view of the simplicity of the result due to the electrons, this reinstatement of the background contribution is trivial. Notice also that for the one-center problem, D_t is rotationally invariant, hence no vector label $\vec{r}'$ is needed.

The result, Eq. (28) is simply a reformulation of Eqs. (11-12). The method of Matsubara poles used by Watrous et al. 1999 via the finite temperature one-body Green's function, is perfectly suited to this local calculation of the density and avoids an explicit solution of Eqs. (24). Indeed, as discussed in detail by Watrous et al. 1999, a local density such as

$\rho_e(r')$ can be directly derived from diagonal matrix elements $\langle r' | (\eta - t - w - \mu' - \mathcal{U})^{-1} | r' \rangle$ of the one-body Green's function. Such matrix elements are integrated on a suitable contour in the η -complex plane. Once $\partial F / \partial Z$ is known for all values of Z smaller than $Z_1 + Z_2$, trivial integrals provide the screening U_0 according to Eq. (10).

5. NUMERICAL RESULTS FOR THE SOLAR CORE

Shielding calculations have been performed for $Z = 1, 2, 4, 6, 8$ at a density and temperature relevant to energy and neutrino production in the sun. From these calculations the fusion enhancement factors are calculated and compared with the results of other researchers. Ricci et al. 1995 have shown that enhancement factors for the relevant fusion reactions are insensitive to the location within the solar core. We use here the set of parameters similar to those employed by Bahcall and Pinsonneault 1995, corresponding to $R/R_\odot = 0.06$. In atomic units, they are $T = 47$, $n_e = 7.63$, $X = 0.432$, $Y = 0.568$. The results are displayed in Table 1 for $\phi(Z, r = 0)$ and $\Delta\rho_e(Z, r = 0) = \rho_e(Z, r = 0) - n_e$. These quantities for other Z -values can be obtained by interpolation. $\phi(Z, r = 0)$ was fitted to a fourth order polynomial,

$$\phi(Z, r = 0) \approx - \sum_{n=1}^4 c_n Z^n. \quad (29)$$

The integral of this quantity then yields the free energy,

$$F(Z) \approx - \sum_{n=1}^4 c_n Z^{n+1} / n, \quad (30)$$

with $c_1 = 2.0275$, $c_2 = -0.03661$, $c_3 = 0.00594$, $c_4 = -0.000103$. Note that $\phi(Z, r = 0)$ is nearly linear in Z .

Table II gives the fusion enhancement factors for several reactions of interest in the solar neutrino problem. The deviation from unity is due to shielding. Note that the various

calculations exhibit a scatter of 10 to 30% and more in the deviation from unity. Although our factors are rather close to the recent calculations of Gruzinov and Bahcall 1998, they are usually somewhat lower.

6. Summary and Conclusions

The finite temperature Green’s function method of Watrous et al. 1999 has been applied to the problem of screening of the nucleus-nucleus interaction in the solar plasma. The method is based on a self consistent, finite temperature Kohn-Sham formalism with the local density approximation for exchange and correlation. Atomic bound states are included on an equal footing with continuum states. Fusion enhancement factors (over pure Coulomb) are calculated for various relevant nuclear reactions at mean conditions (temperature and density) of the solar core. Comparisons with several other calculations are presented.

The method appears to have no restriction with respect to temperature or density for stars in “non catastrophic,” thermal equilibrium states. When implementing calculations for other systems, one may need to extend the range of parameters for the local exchange-correlation term, which is quite small for our solar system.

7. Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the U. S. Department of Energy and by the U. S. National Science Foundation.

Table 1: Results of solar screening calculations for various values of Z . ϕ and $\Delta\rho_e$ are calculated values; the free energy F is based on the polynomial fit.

Z	$\phi(Z, r = 0)$	$\Delta\rho_e(Z, r = 0)$	$F(Z)$
1	2.007	2.791	-1.008
2	3.944	6.829	-4.009
3	—	—	-8.962
4	7.884	20.76	-15.82
5	—	—	-24.54
6	12.00	49.77	-35.14
7	—	—	-47.65
8	16.51	108.6	-62.19

Table 2: Fusion enhancement factors for the solar interior (This Work), compared with other screening calculations: WES is Salpeter’s weak screening approximation(Salpeter 1954); Mit is Mitler’s Thomas-Fermi-like model(Mitler 1977); GDGC is due to Graboske et al. 1973; CSK is the dynamic screening model of Carraro et al. 1988; GB is due to Gruzinov and Bahcall 1998.

reaction	This Work	WES	Mit	GDGC	CSK	GB
$p + p$	1.043	1.049	1.045	1.049	1.038	1.053
He+He	1.181	1.213	1.176	1.115	1.158	1.224
Be+ p	1.183	1.213	1.171	1.112	1.169	1.166
N+ p	1.356	1.402	1.293	1.191	1.324	1.393

REFERENCES

- Gruzinov, A. V., and Bahcall, J. N. 1998, *Astrophys. J.*, 504, 996
- Carraro, C., Schäfer, A., and S. E. Koonin 1988, *Astrophys. J.* 331, 565
- Watrous, M. J., Wilets, L., and Rehr, J. J. 1999, *Phys. Rev.*, 59, 3554
- Salpeter, E. E., 1954, *Australian J. Phys.*, 7, 373
- Clayton, D. D., 1968, *Principles of Stellar Evolution and Nucleosynthesis*, McGraw-Hill
(New York 1975), p. 359.
- Mermin, N. D., 1965, *Phys. Rev.* 137, A144
- Ricci, B., Degl’Innocenti, S., and Fiorentini, G. 1995, *Phys. Rev. C*, 52 1095
- Bahcall, J. N. and Pinsonneault, M. H. 1995, *Rev. Modern Phys.*, 67, 781
- Mitler, H. E. 1977, *Astrophys. J.*, 212, 513
- Graboske, H. C., DeWitt, H. E., Grossman, A. S. and M. S. Cooper 1973, *Astrophys. J.*,
181, 457